Finance Ministry, there is a happy situation that whatever money accrues through our ticketed monuments, we are getting that as an additionality. Secondly, there are more than 10,000 heritage monuments. Out of them, only 3606 monuments are centrally-protected, whereas the total number of heritage monuments is more than 10,000. Therefore, we require a public-private partnership to maintain and upgrade these monuments. So, we are actively pursuing the National Culture Fund. In last one year, there were about 8 corporate houses, like the IOCL. It has instituted one Indian Oil Foundation through which it has given us Rs. 25 crores and has asured us to give Rs. 10 crores every year. Sir, there are other corporate houses like the Oberois, the Agha Khan Foundation, the Poona Municipal Corporation, the Taj Group of Hotels, the Apeejay Hotels, etc. Many of them have come forward and signed MoUs with the Archaeological Survey of India and the NCF, and are trying to upgrade various monuments across the country.

SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI: Sir, I commend the efforts of the hon. Minister in this regard, but I would like to say that, unfortunately, the less accessible places are still being neglected. I want to draw the attention of the Minister to such places. That is where the Archaeological Survey of India should really focus its attention.

SHRI ANANTH KUMAR: I request Chaturvedi Saheb to bring in a sponsor with whom we are ready to sign an MoU.

SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI: Sir, I am afraid, everybody in Uttar Pradesh is not as affluent as the people in Bangalore and in Mumbai are. I wish it were so.

Generation and consumption of power in the Country

*142. SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE: Will the Minister of POWER be pleased to state:

(a) the power generation and consumption in the country during the last five years (in billing units);

(b) the projections of the 15th Electric Power Survey (EPS) during the above period;

(c) the reasons for variation between the projections and the actuals; and

(d) the T&D losses during the above years?

THE MINISTER OF POWER (SHRI SURESH PRABHU): (a) to (d) A Statement is laid on the Table of the House.

Statement

(a) A table showing the power generation and consumption in the country during the five years period 1994-95 to 1998-99 is given below:

Year	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99
Power Generation in BUs (Net)	329.199	356.391	371.311	394.668	421.218
Electricity Consumption in BUs	259.629	277.028	280.206	296.748	309.734

(b) The projections made for the corresponding period by the 15th Electric Power Survey (EPS) is given below:

Year	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99
Energy Requirement —BUs (At power station bus-bar) EPS.	349.346	376.679	405.823	436.258	469.057
Energy Consumption —BUs (At consumers end)	273.025	294.762	317.977	342.253	368.507

(c) The variation between the energy requirement projected by EPS and Energy supplied is mainly on account of restrictions imposed on power demand due to power cuts and load shedding as well as

slippages in capacity addition programme. If allowance is made for energy not supplied due to power cuts and load shedding, the percentage of variation between the projection made by the 15th EPS and the actual energy requirement reduces substantially. The variation between the projected figures (15th EPS) and the actual figure is given below:

Year	Projections As per 15th EPS (BUs)	Energy supplied (BUs)	Energy not supplied (BUs)	Total energy require-ment (BUs) (iii)+(iv)	% Variation between (ii) & (v)
1994-95	349.346	329.199	24.979	354.178	(—)1.4
1995-96	376.679	356.391	35.679	392.067	(—)3.9
1996-97	405.823	371.311	47.590	418.901	(—)3.1
1997-98	436.258	394.668	34.175	428.843	(+)1.7
1998-99	469.057	421.218	26.349	447.567	(+)4.8

(d) Percentage T&D losses in the country for the years 1994-95 to 1998-99 are as under:

Year	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99
T&D losses %	21.13	22.27	24.53	24.79	26.45

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE: Sir, as per the figures given in part (a) of the answer, the increase in electricity consumption from 1994-95 up to 1998-1999—I have even taken the figure of 1999-2000—comes to roughly 5 per cent. In this connection I would quote what the then Power Secretary had stated before a Standing Committee, which had given its report here in May 1995. He said:

> "The growth in power consumption during the 80s was 8 per cent. At the very conservative level, it can be anticipated at 9 per cent during 8th, 9th and 10th Plans."

If that is so, an additional capacity of 1.4 lakh megawatts will have to be created till 2007. But, what has been found, as you rightly noted, in spite of the fact that we had 70,000 megawatts in 1995, today we are having about 97,000 megawatts of installed capacity. It is an addition of about 20,000 megawatts. For one-third of the day we are having high frequency problems in most parts of the country. That means the whole capacity addition, which has been planned, was based on some unrealistic assumptions. Today I find here also, 5 per cent growth is there. From one letter that I have received from you, Mr. Minister, I find that you are trying to have a capacity addition of one lakh megawatts more by the year 2012. My question is: what type of consumption growth are you anticipating? Again, you need not err on the positive side. Would you kindly review this capacity addition based on the existing consumption growth? I think this review can be done within the parameters of whatever coherence and discipline that you have in the Government. This can be done. I do not think there will be any problem. Would you kindly review this based on the consumption growth that you have envisaged for this capacity addition?

SHRI SURESH PRABHU: Sir, it is an absolutely relevant and pertinent point. It is true that during the 8th and 9th Plan our capacity addition programme had reached to about 51 per cent to 52 per cent of what we had really planned. It is true that in some parts of the country the energy shortage should not have been to the extent to which it is, because our capacity addition programme is not keeping pace with what was really required. Then obviously the shortage should have been higher, but this has really happened. Sir, there are several factors which have contributed to this. During the 1st Five-Year Plan, the elasticity of power generation to GDP was about 3.14 per cent. It, in fact, had gone up to four times. Now it has come down to less than one per cent. There is a changing pattern of the Indian economy, which is also contributing to this thing. You must be aware that the industry contributes to about 54 per cent of

the demand. Domestic users contribute to about 20 percent of the demand. The Commercial share is 7 per cent while the share of irrigation comes to about 10.2 per cent and others about 8.8 per cent. This is as of today. If you take the energy consumption pattern of the year 2000, this roughly is the indication. But, it has changed over a period of time.

Now, the challenge before us as pointed out in the 16th Power Survey Report is the question which I am also deliberating over—how can we capture the changing pattern of the Indian economy into demand projection for power in the coming year? This is the real challenge. In fact, I have already directed the Central Electricity Authority to work in tandem with the Planning Commission, capture this changing pattern and then come out with a realistic demand projection for the 16th Power Survey period.

When I say this, I would point out that only 31 per cent of the people in India are provided with electricity. Sixty-nine per cent of the people could not be provided electricity. When we are really talking about these 31 per cent of the people, even these 31 per cent of the people are not getting enough electricity, because, as you rightly pointed out, the frequency variations also contribute to the quality of power. And because there is a demand-supply fluctuation, there is not an adequate investment, which has really got into distribution, the over-stretching of distribution lines spread over long distances has contributed to deteriorating quality of power. On the one hand we need to improve the quality of these 31 per cent of the people who are getting electricity, and on the other, we need to provide electricity to the remaining 69 per cent of the population. We must capture the changing pattern of the Indian economy, where in services are now contributing more to the GDP than the manufacturing sector. Over a period of time this changing pattern is now emerging. Therefore, after taking all these factors into consideration, we must have a realistic 16th Power Survey Report projections. But, presently the 16th Power Survey projection, which has come, is about 1,00,000 megawatts. How and on what has it been based? There is something like, what they call, a partial end-use

pattern study, wherein two types of surveys are done. One, they actually find out from an industry which consumes more than 1 MW of power, how much is the projection for the next 5 years, 10 years and 15 years. Based on that, they project it. They also go to the Ministry of Agriculture and find out how many new pumpsets are going to be energised. On that basis, they actually work out the projections for the agricultural sector. They also go to the commercial sector and find out their consumption. For example, this time, they discussed with the information technology industry a great deal because they are also using power to a great extent. So, after doing all this exercise, they really know exactly what is going to be the projection from the industry, and how much power do they require. But in the case of certain other sectors like household and commercial establishments, it is only a trend which is really taken into consideration. After taking all these combinations into account, the demand is projected.

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE: Mr. Chairman, Sir, what I wanted to convey was something else. I said, we have erred on positive side. I see a pattern in it. I will come to it. My question was limited to the consumption growth. The consumption growth was 8 per cent. But we have envisaged 9 per cent in the Eighth Plan and the Ninth Plan. That has not been achieved. Even today, the consumption growth is only 5 per cent. Based on 8 per cent and 9 per cent, a tremendous capital intensive planning has been done. He talked of 1,00,000 MW of power. I would like to tell the Minister that someone is misleading him. I think the whole planning is lop-sided. In a capital-starved country, we cannot have such a capital intensive planning. That is my first question.

My second question also pertains to that. You must review this question of 1,00,000 MW power capacity, Today, what is you problem? On an average, the shortage right now is 7.5 per cent. At the peaking period, the shortage is 11 per cent, whereas, in the Eighth Plan the peaking shortage was 20 per cent. Today, the shortage is 11.6 per cent and 7.5 per cent. Today, you have 97,000 MW of installed power capacity, Your plant load factor is 67.5 per cent. So, you are supplying only 67,000 or 70,000 MW of power. If

you increase the plant load factor by 3 to 4 per cent for which you don't have to do anything; only by renovation, modernisation and extension of the life of the existing plants, you can reduce the losses. Today, your losses have gone up from 21 per cent to 26 per cent. This 5 per cent loss can be made up. Today, the shortage can be made up with the existing capacity. For the last several years, the Government's planning has been on capacity addition, with a fancied idea of 9 per cent consumption growth. In view of this position, I would like the Government to review it. Today, that should be the priority. Instead of adding 1,00,000 MW capacity, it should be reviewed again. This is number one.

Your T and D losses is 26 per cent. I have been told, it is 40 to 50 per cent throughout the country. Now, you are going to add 1,00,000 MW of power. May I know from the Minister whether it has been quantified, qualified, calculated based on the present loss or on the basis of any standard loss? What has been done? As has been told, if the loss throughout the country is 40 per cent loss, when you go on adding additional capacity of power, then, the actual losses will be much more. This additional capacity of power of 1,00,000 MW may cost you Rs. 4,00,000 crores. Is it based on the present loss or on a standard loss for the next 12 years to come? I think, you have to review it. I don't think it will be within the parameters of discipline and quarrels in your Government. I would request you to review it.

SHRI SURESH PRABHU: Mr. Chairman, Sir, in fact, on that point also I intend to concur with the hon. Member. The new initiatives that the Government of India have taken in the Ministry of Power are in conformity with the thinking that you are trying to propagate. What we are doing now is just not keeping on adding greenfield capacity, not just keep on adding new projects. Now our thrust is—as the hon. Member, Shri S.B. Chavan knows because he is a member of the Consultative Committee—on modernisation. I just want to correct the statement of the hon. Member. The present PLF is not 67. It has already touched 69 against the target of 70. But we are trying to improve on that. I will give you the exact figure later. We are also trying to improve the maintenance of the existing plants

wherein the residual life of the power plants is going to be over. In fact, we are trying to upgrade those plants. That is the second choice. Thirdly, the House is also going to discuss a Bill for energy conservation. We are not just paying attention to the supply side management. Now, we are laying new thrust on the demand side management wherein we are trying to actually conserve power, to the extent possible. Now, we are encouraging the use of such gadgets which will not be energy-guzzlers. We are trying to ensure that the demand side management results in saving of power. The potential is as high as 40 per cent on the demand side management. So, for the first time, I have appointed a reputed NGO as consultant to go into the potential for the demand side management, which was not done earlier. And this potential will now be assessed for agriculture, for manufacturing and for services, separately with state-specific potential. This is being done.

Fourthly, we are evacuating power from the eastern region where the capacity utilisation of the existing power plants is lower because the demand for power in the eastern sector is lower. Therefore, we are now putting up a transmission network to evacuate power from the eastern region to the rest of the country. This is the fourth measure we have taken.

We have also taken measures for revamping the entire distribution sector. I am very happy to inform the House that, for the first time, we are preparing district-wise surveys of each and every district in India to find out what are the technical interventions which are required to improve the quality of power; we are also in the process of effecting system improvement that is really called for, which will also release the excess power available, without making investment in generation. These are the steps we have taken. We have selected 50 districts wherein under the Accelerated Power Development Programme, we are going to make investment from the Central sector. These are the steps we are taking.

I would like to assure the hon. Member that it is not the priority of the Government only to keep on adding greenfield capacity. I was

giving the figure of 100,000 MW which is estimated by the 16th Power Survey Report. While we are preparing targets for generation capacity, let me tell you, we are also working on 100,000 MW. We are taking all these measures which will result in saving of power, with the least cost, in the shortest possible time. That is also a priority of the Government.

SHRI J. CHITHARANJAN: Sir, I am happy to know that the hon. Minister is taking several steps to avoid lopsided planning in the electricity sector. But it is a fact that there is, as the Minister himself has said, a dearth of electricity to the extent of 7.5 per cent in general; and in peak hours, 11 per cent. These are only percentages; in some areas, in actual terms, the dearth of electricity will be much more. For the development of industry and also the economy, availability of electricity, that too, at affordable rates, is a very important factor, Therefore, I would like to know whether the hon. Minister has any plan, a time-bound plan, to provide electricity, whatever is required at a particular moment of time, say, within five years or six years. Have you got a plan for that?

SHRI SURESH PRABHU: Yes, Sir. We have a plan made that by the year 2012, power will be available on demand. But let me qualify that statement. When I say "available on demand", consumption of electricity also depends on the ability of the people to pay for the electricity. Sir, in economics, the basic dictum is—Dr. Manmohanji will actually be able to say; I am a student of economics, he is a master of economics—a mere desire does not constitute a demand, unless it is backed by purchasing power. Therefore, the supply of electricity would be available, but whether people will be able to actually buy it or not depends on the purchasing power. So, all this will depend on the general growth in economy. If the rural income really raises, they will be able to afford it. But, Sir, the target of the Ministry of Power is to make available power on demand to all those who wish to buy and who have the ability to buy, by the year 2012.

श्री विजय जे॰ दर्डा: मंत्री महोदय ने देश में विद्युत की जेनेरेशन और डिस्ट्रिब्यूशन संबंधी जानकारी दी। मैं यह भी जानता हूं कि आज देश के अंदर अनेक किसान ऐसे हैं जो बिजली के बिना अपना उत्पादन पूरा नहीं कर पा रहे हैं। कई औद्योगिक इकाइयां हैं जो बंद हैं। मंत्री जी

जिस किसी भी विभाग में रहे हैं बहुत अच्छा बोल कर लोगों को कभी-कभी गुमराह भी कर देते हैं और उन पर अपना प्रभाव अलग ढंग से डालने का प्रयत्न करते हैं। यह जो आपने कहा कि सन् 2012 तक पूरे देश में बिजली मिलेगी और डिमांड और सप्लाई के बारे में भी मेरे ख्याल से प्लानिंग करते समय में आप निश्चित ध्यान रखते हैं कि अगर पेइंग केपैसिटी और एवेलिबिलिटी दोनों का संबंध जोड़ा जाता है तो क्या उसके साथ यह भी प्लानिंग है कि मांगने पर बिजली मिलेगी और बिजली मिलेगी तो वह क्वालिटेटिव बिजली मिलेगी? यह मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से जानना चाहता हूं।

श्री सुरेश प्रभु: सर, बिजली की एवेलिबिलिटी जेनरेशन से जुड़ी हुई एक समस्या है। इसके साथ ही साथ क्वालिटी ऑफ पावर को इम्प्रूव करने के लिए ट्रांसमिशन, सब-ट्रांसमिशन डिस्ट्रीब्यूशन में भी जितना इन्वेस्टमेंट हम जेनरेशन में करते हैं उतनी ही इसमें करने की जरूरत है। दुर्भाग्य से हमने जितना निवेश जेनरेशन में करने की कोशिश की है उतना निवेश दुर्भाग्य से हमने ट्रांसमिशन और डिस्ट्रीब्यूशन में नहीं किया और इसकी वजह से यह हुआ कि आज हमारी पॉलसीज थोड़ी सी स्क्यूड इन फेवर ऑफ जेनरेशन थी, लेकिन हमारा आज भी प्रयास है कि हम डिस्ट्रीब्यूशन में सबसे पहले सुधार लायें। यदि वितरण प्रणाली में सुधार आता है तो उसका असर पावर सैक्टर के इम्प्रूवमेंट में भी होगा और साथ ही साथ क्वालिटी की इम्प्रूवमेंट में भी होगा। जब पावर जेनरेट की जाती है, उसके बाद उसको ट्रांसमिट करके सब-ट्रांसमिट करते हैं। उसको डिस्ट्रीब्यूट करने से पहले हम स्टेप डाउन ट्रांसफार्मर में लगाकर स्टेप डाउन करते हैं। लेकिन इस पूरी व्यवस्था में यदि हम निवेश पूरी तरह से नहीं करेंगे तो यह नहीं हो पायेगा। इसके बारे में मैंने शुरू में ही कहा कि हमने एक्सलरेटिड पावर डेवलेपमेंट प्रोग्राम जैसे नये कार्यक्रम की शुरूआत इसी साल से की है। पहले साल में 1000 करोड़ रुपया हमने उसमें निवेश करने के लिए बजट में प्रावधान किया है। इस करंट ईयर में 1500 करोड़ रुपये का प्रावधान बजट में किया है और जो प्लानिंग कमीशन ने एक्सपर्ट ग्रुप अपाइंट किया था, उनकी तो यह राय है कि इसमें काफी वृद्धि होने की जरूरत है। यह निवेश, 70 परसेंट ऑफ दिस इन्वेस्टमेंट, हम वितरण व्यवस्था में सुधार लाने के लिए करेंगे और यदि वितरण व्यवस्था में सुधार होता है तो क्वालिटी ऑफ पावर भी सुधरेगी। आज जिस तरह से देश में पावर सैक्टर में सुधार लाने की कोशिश हो रही है, हम हमेशा टैरिफ में वृद्धि करके सुधार करने की कोशिश करते हैं। यदि टैरिफ में वृद्धि होती है और क्वालिटी आफ पावर में सुधार नहीं होगा, उसकी गुणवत्ता में सुधार नहीं होगा तो लोगों की शिकायतें बढ़ जाती हैं क्योंकि एक तरफ तो उनको ज्यादा टैरिफ देना पड़ता है और दूसरी तरफ गुणवत्ता में सुधार नहीं आता है। इसलिए आपूर्ति करने के साथ-साथ गुणवत्ता में भी

सुधार लाने की जरूरत है। यही हमारी नीति है। इसीलिए हमने उसको पूरी तरह से रिवेम्प करने की कोशिश की है।

सर, आनरेबुल मेम्बर्स की नॉलेज के लिए हमने बहुत ही जल्द एक कम्प्रहेंसिव गाइड बनाई है कि किस तरह से आगे आने वाले 10 साल में पूरी वितरण व्यवस्था में सुधार आयेगा, उससे क्या-क्या लाभ देश को होगा। मैं आनरेबुल मेम्बर को और सभी सदस्यों को एक बुकलेट जरूर डिस्ट्रीव्यूट करूंगा।

श्री राजीव शुक्ल: सभापति महोदय, पावर जेनरेशन की बात हो रही है लेकिन जो माहौल मुल्क में है, कोई भी मेगा पावर प्रोजेक्ट निकल कर नहीं आ रहा है। क्या मंत्री जी यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि जितने मेगा पावर प्रोजेक्ट्स सैंक्शन हुये थे, उनमें से कितने का फाइनेंसियल क्लोजर हुआ है, कितने का अभी बाकी है और कब शुरू होने वाले हैं?

सर, दूसरा एक सवाल एनरॉन के स्टेटस के बारे में है। इसके बारे में इतना कंफ्यूजन है कि पता नहीं चल रहा है कि यह रहेगा कि नहीं रहेगा। अजीत कुमार जो फाइनेंस सेक्रेटरी हैं वे कहते हैं कि कैबिनेट को उनका एक सुझाव गया था कि एनरॉन अब सस्ती बिजली देने के लिए तैयार है और उसको नेशनल पावर ग्रिड में लाकर के बाकी स्टेट गवर्नमेंट्स को दी जा सकती है। क्या यह सही है? मैं ये दोनों सवाल जानना चाहता हूं।

श्री सुरेश प्रभु: सर, नये पावर को जेनरेट करने के लिए यदि हमारे देश की पूंजी लगती है या विदेश से पूंजी मंगाकर यदि इसको करना है तो जब तक हमारा पावर सैक्टर कमर्शियली वायबिल नहीं होगा तब तक इस तरह का एवरेशन्स जिसको हमने नोटिस किया है उस तरह की एवरेशन्स आती रहेंगी।

सर, इसके पहले हमारी प्राथमिकता यह होनी चाहिए कि किस तरह से पावर सैक्टर को कमर्शियली वायबिल किया जाय। यदि हमारी कॉस्ट ऑफ सप्लाई पावर तीन रुपये है और एवरेज कॉस्ट आफ टैरिफ दो रुपये है तो एक रुपये हर यूनिट में बनता जायेगा। यदि हमने पांच सौ मिलियन यूनिट्स पिछले साल बेची हैं तो मैं यह मानता हूं कि इससे हमारे पावर सैक्टर की स्थिति और भी बिगड़ जायेगी। इसके साथ-साथ हमारा यह प्रयास जरूर है कि नये पावर प्रोजेक्ट्स हमारे देश में बनें, निवेश से बनें, जो हमारे देश की पूंजी है उससे बनें या जो विदेश से पूंजी आयेगी उससे बनें। लेकिन इसके साथ-साथ जब तक हम कमर्शियल वायबिलिटी इस सैक्टर में नहीं लाते हैं तब तक हमें गारंटी या काउन्टर गारंटी जैसे प्रावधान करने होंगे, जिसके खिलाफ में खुद हूं और मैं नहीं मानता हूं कि इस तरह के पावर प्रोजेक्ट्स आने चाहिए।

सर, इसीलिए हमने यह प्रयास किया है कि जो नये पावर प्रोजेक्ट्स देश में लायेंगे, वे अपनी खुद की ताकत के ऊपर ही लायेंगे और जब तक उनमें खुद यह ताकत सम्भव नहीं होगी तो हमारी पब्लिक इन्वेस्टमेंट को स्टेप अप करके हमें पावर प्रोजेक्ट्स लाने चाहिए और यही प्रयास हम 11वीं पंचवर्षीय योजना में जरूर करेंगे। इसके अतिरिक्त एनरॉन के संबंध में उन्होंने कुछ सवाल पूछा है, अजीत कुमार जी की चिट्ठी के संबंध में भी पूछा है। यदि वह चिट्ठी आप मुझे दे देंगे तो मैं पढ़कर जवाब दे दूंगा।

श्री राजीव शुक्ल: वह चिट्ठी तो कैबीनेट में गयी है।

श्री सुरेश प्रभु: कैबीनेट मिनिस्टर न होते हुए भी यदि वह आपके पास हो तो आप मुझे दे दीजिए।

श्री राजीव शुक्ल: ठीक है, मैं दे दूंगा।

SHRI N.K. PREMACHANDRAN: Sir, the answer given by the Minister shows that the transmission and distribution loss in the year 1994-95 was 21.13%. That has been enhanced to 26.45% in the year 1998-99. When the technology is advanced, the transmission and distribution loss is also advancing, or it is also increasing. Is there any modern technology to contain this T and D loss? That is part (a) of my question. And part (b) of my question relates to the generation of power. The global scenario shows that, compared to other countries, India is the only country having utilised the least percentage of the power potential. Norway has utilised 58 per cent; Brazil - 31 per cent, and Canada - 41 per cent. India has utilised only 15 per cent of the power potential. I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether his Government would give priority to the hydroelectric projects. There are so many hydroelectric projects pending in Kerala, especially, the Pooyamkutty Project. It is pending for sanction from the Central Government. It has been pending for so many years. There is also the Silent Valley Power Project. The then Prime Minister, Smt. Indira Gandhi, had given an assurance that after 20 years it would be reviewed. I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether that would be reviewed, and whether the Pooyamkutty Project would be accorded sanction.

SHRI SURESH PRABHU: Sir, firstly, the transmission and distribution loss has two components. One is the technical component, and the other is commercial component. As far as the technical component is concerned, that can be improved with technology; I fully

agree with him. The commercial component is related to the administration. The commercial component of the T and D loss in India is mainly accounted for by thefts. Therefore, really speaking, technology can help to curtail it with electronic meters, remote sensing meters, and all that is possible, which we are using now. But, Sir, primarily, to improve that, relating to the administration of State Electricity Boards, the State Governments will have to take effective steps to control thefts. And, therefore, we are even thinking of introducing a comprehensive legislation in the Parliament in which we .will also make enough provision to deter thefts from taking place.

Sir, as far as the hydro potential taking place in the country is concerned, it is absolutely correct, the hon. Member is absolutely right in saying that, so far, what we have tapped is only 17 per cent of the hydro potential available in the country. The total hydro potential in India is 1,50,000 megawatts. We have already asked the Central Electricity Authority, in association with the Central Water Commission and APCOST, to prepare a detailed pre-feasibility report, *i.e.* survey and investigation, because when we talk about the hydro potential, there is a huge displacement of population, and we have to actually resettle the people when we come out with the hydro power project. Therefore, the survey and investigation work is going on. Hopefully, within the next few months itself, we will be able to come before the country with a blueprint and an action plan on, how we are going to exploit, and what percentage of exploitation is possible of these 1,50,000 megawatts, in the shortest possible time.

Sir, this issue, as you have correctly pointed out, is connected to the energy security of India. If you are going to generate power on the fuel which is going to be imported, then we are actually getting ourselves exposed to the higher exchange risk as well as the increasing prices of the imported fuel. So, we must plan our energy sector in a manner that our fuel is locally available, and in case of hydro power generation, there is no fuel required. So, over a period of time, the generation cost will go down because it will be non-consumptive use of water for making hydropower generation.

SHRI N.K. PREMACHANDRAN: Sir, my question concerning the pending power project has not been answered....*(Interruptions)*...We have to take sanction from the Cental Government for the Pooyamkutty Project. What is the response of the Government?

SHRI SURESH PRABHU: Sir, we will definitely find out, and if the State Government wants that project to be undertaken by the Central Government, the National Hydro Power Corporation will undertake that project. If the Kerala Government will be willing to sign the power purchase agreement, we will definitely be willing to support that project.

SHRI PREM CHAND GUPTA: Mr. Chairman, Sir, the very basis of power survey is wrong in my opinion. The Minister has said that he has surveyed the units. The industrial units having a requirement of one Megawatt of power or more have been surveyed, and they have been asked to project their requirements for the next five, ten, fifteen, twenty years. I hope, Sir, you should have known that 50 per cent of the units using more than one megawatt of power have their own captive power plants. The actual industrial users of power are the smaller ones. The units that they require are 50 kilowatts or 100 kilowatts or 200 kilowatts or 500 kilowatts. So, your projection or your survey is wrong. When you surveyed the industrial sector, being one of the largest users of power, you have surveyed a wrong sector. Then how can your projections be correct? I would like to know your views on this.

The second part of my question is that just before the General Elections a super thermal power plant at Barh was announced. Now the people of Barh are waiting for you and Mr. Nitish kumar. What happened to this project? More than two years have passed and nothing has happened. What are your views on this?

SHRI SURESH PRABHU: Sir, first, I would like to clarify the first point. When the Sixteenth Power Survey Report was finalised, they did very elaborate work. I was trying to say that they did partial end-use pattern survey. What is meant by that is that in the case of certain types of sectors they go by their actual requirement, whereas in the case of others they find out the trend and on the basis of the

trend they do it. For example, it is inconceivable and it is impossible for anybody to think that to have a Power Survey Report somebody will go to everybody's house or every small-scale industry and find out how much is the power required. The small-scale industry is taken into account. It is not that it has been excluded. What I am trying to say is that only in the case of bigger users that they have taken their actual consumption and their actual position is taken into account, whereas in the case of the rest of the manufacturing sector their combined cumulative growth rate that is projected by the small-scale industry, by various industry associations, by various trade bodies, is taken into account. It is not that we are totally ignorant or we are totally oblivious of what the small-scale sector is doing. It is, in fact, one of the important components of Indian manufacturing sector. So, how can they be excluded? It is taken into account.

As far as the second part of his question that the Barh people are waiting for me for the good news is concerned, I thank him for conveying that to me. We are proceeding with that project and hopefully in the month of September or October we will be starting the construction work at Barh.

SHRI PRAFUL PATEL: Sir, the knowledgeable Minister's written reply to this question is very interesting. According to him, there is more power generation and less power consumption. That shows there is no power shortage in the country at all. That is not actually the case. We all know that there is surplus power in some States and there is deficiency of power in some other States. That could be the reasons for this. Having said that, we still know that there is a tremendous need for power to be evacuated from one State to another State. That is why you have the Power Grid Corporation, which is really the genesis, on the basis of which you are supplying power all over the country. I would like to know from the Minister that if there is surplus power in one State and it has to be sold to another State through the Power Grid Corporation, do you have any policy by which, on a pricing basis, you will be able to evacuate power from one State to another State.

The second part of my question is this. As in the case of Enron, which is an independent power producer, where you have had a problem with the State Electricity Board, which is not able to pay the requisite cost of power because of high tariff based on cost of capital, variable cost of fuel and whatever the other considerations, if the State Electricity Boards are unable to buy power at a particular price, I don't think in future any IPP will be able to come and sell its power to the State Electricity Boards. In that case, the only option is the Central Power Grid Corporation. Having said that, do you also have a policy by which you will be able to buy power from an IPP through the Power Grid Corporation? Do you have a pricing policy for buying power from State Electricity Board or an IIP? Please answer that.

SHRI SURESH PRABHU: Sir, the hon. Member has raised a number of questions. The first one is: When the power generated is more, why is the consumption less? What is the cause of that? One part of his question he has really answered that it is due to macro-level situation. At the micro-level there may be some shortage. But at the macro-level there could be a surplus. The net result of that is there is a surplus. The second contributing factor to this phenomenon, this paradox, is that there is power, which is generated, but cannot be consumed because of the system problem. The system itself cannot absorb that power. The distribution network is not geared up to absorb the power that is generated. That is the cause. Therefore, we really need to revamp distribution, as I said earlier. Therefore, that is the real cause of this type of phenomenon which is reflected in the answer. Secondly, the hon. Member wanted to know about the role of the Power Grid Corporation and if the Power Grid Corporation did not buy power or sell power, then what would happen. The Power Grid Corporation is a transmission utility whose job is to link the transmission network when power is generated, between the generating point *i.e.* the bus bar and the load point. This is what they do. In fact, the Central Government is now in the process of formulating a policy to create a national grid throughout the country so that on a real time basis, we are able to transmit power from the surplus area to the deficient area without much difficulty. The amount of investment that would be required to attain

this would come to Rs. 18,000 crores. That is what we are actually doing. As far as the independent power producers are concerned, if they face any difficulty in selling power and if the House feels that whatever independent power producers come and generate power, if they fail to sell power because of some problem with the SEB, then the Central Government utilities must buy that power and they should suffer the loss, if this is the combined view of the House, the Government would consider it.

Rural development budget

*143. SHRI RAJNATH SINGH 'SURYA': Will the Minister of RURAL DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

(a) what is the percentage of rural development budget to the total Central budget; and

(b) what was the percentage-wise allocation of this budget to States and UTs during the last two years?

THE MINISTER OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT (SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU): (a) The Central Plan outlay to the Ministry of Rural Development during 2001-2002 is 20.62% of the total Central Budget (gross Budgetary Support).

(b) The percentage-wise allocation of funds under the programmes of the Ministry of Rural Development to different States and UTs during 1999-2000 and 2000-2001 is given in the Statement.

Statement

Allocation of funds to State during 1999-2000 & 2000-2001 by the Ministry of Rural Development (percentage)

Sl. No.	States/UTs	1999-2000	2000-2001
1	2	3	4
1.	ANDHRA PR.	6.86	7.55
2.	ARUNACHAL PR.	0.45	0.73
3.	ASSAM	4.29	6.13
4.	BIHAR	16.51	8.93
5.	CHHATISGARH	NA	3.26
6.	GOA	0.09	0.18